

## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT



From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:  
AOYAMA & PARTNERS  
Attn. Aoyama, Tamotsu  
IMP Building, 3-7 Shiromi 1-chome  
Chuo-ku, Osaka-shi  
Osaka 540-0001  
JAPAN

## INVITATION TO PAY ADDITIONAL FEES

(PCT Article 17(3)(a) and Rule 40.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>663654</b>	Date of mailing (day/month/year) <b>08/08/2003</b>
International application No. <b>PCT/JP 03/ 03140</b>	<b>PAYMENT DUE</b> within <b>45</b> <del>XXXX</del> days from the above date of mailing
Applicant <b>MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO. LTD.</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>17/03/2003</b>

## 1. This International Searching Authority

- (i) considers that there are 04 (number of) inventions claimed in the international application covered by the claims indicated ~~XXXX~~ on the extra sheet:

and it considers that the international application does not comply with the requirements of unity of invention (Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3) for the reasons indicated ~~XXXX~~ on the extra sheet:

- (ii) ☒ has carried out a partial international search (see Annex) ☐ will establish the international search report on those parts of the international application which relate to the invention first mentioned in claims Nos.:  
**1, 13, 20**

- (iii) will establish the international search report on the other parts of the international application only if, and to the extent to which, additional fees are paid

## 2. The applicant is hereby invited, within the time limit indicated above, to pay the amount indicated below:

EUR 945,00 x 03 = EUR 2.835,00  
Fee per additional invention      number of additional inventions      total amount of additional fees

Or, \_\_\_\_\_ x \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_

The applicant is informed that, according to Rule 40.2(c), the payment of any additional fee may be made under protest, i.e., a reasoned statement to the effect that the international application complies with the requirement of unity of invention or that the amount of the required additional fee is excessive.

3. ☒ Claim(s) Nos. s PCT/ISA206 have been found to be unsearchable under Article 17(2)(b) because of defects under Article 17(2)(a) and therefore have not been included with any invention.

Name and mailing address of the International Searching Authority



European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk  
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,  
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

*Bauić*  
Ainhua Barrio Baranano

外國方式

This International Searching Authority found multiple (groups of) inventions in this international application, as follows:

1. Claims: 1,13,20

An apparatus and software program for controlling resources at an intermediate network element, by performing network control decisions based on specified rules.

2. Claims: 2, 9, 10 and 12

Apparatuses and method for distributing rules for controlling resources

3. Claim : 5 and 8

Apparatus and method for storing signatures, wherein the signatures are retrieved from packets, and indicate capabilities of network elements to control resources.

4. Claim : 14

An apparatus for enabling the activation of one or more rules at an intermediate network element.

The reasons are the following:

1.

Claim 1 has no common or corresponding features with claims 2, 5, 8-10, 12 and 14. The potential special technical features of claim 1 and claims 2, 5, 8-10, 12 and 14 are therefore not identical or corresponding either.

Since the potential special technical features and potential inventive concepts of claim 1 and claims 2, 5, 8-10, 12 and 14, as listed above, are different and do not correspond either, the requirement for unity of invention is not fulfilled (Rule 13.2 PCT).

Since claim 13 is dependent on claim 1, and claims 1 and 20 have common features ("special package"), and share a common concept, these claims have been grouped together in the first group of invention.

2.

The remaining claims 2, 5, 8-10, 12 and 14 ~~are~~ do not relate to a single invention either:

Claim 2 has no common or corresponding technical features with claims 5, 8 and 14. The potential special technical features of claim 2 and claims 5, 8 and 14 are therefore not identical or corresponding either.

Since the potential special technical features and potential inventive concepts of claim 2 and claims 5, 8 and 14, as listed above, are different and do not correspond either, the requirement for unity of

invention is not fulfilled (Rule 13.2 PCT).

Since claim 2 and 9 have common features ("a method of parsing"), claim 2 and 10 have common features ("a method of identifying the target network element"), and claim 2 and 12 also have a common feature ("retrieval"), and claims 2, 9, 10 and 12 share a common concept, these claims have been grouped together in the second group of invention.

3.

The remaining claims 5, 8 and 14 relate to two more inventions:

Claim 5 has no common or corresponding technical features with claim 14. The potential special technical features of claim 2 and claim 14 are therefore not identical or corresponding either.

Since the potential special technical features and potential inventive concepts of claim 5 and claim 14, as listed above, are different and do not correspond either, the requirement for unity of invention is not fulfilled (Rule 13.2 PCT).

Since claim 5 and 8 have corresponding features (storing of signatures), and share a common concept, these claims have been grouped together in the third group of invention.

The remaining claim 14 is grouped in the fourth group of invention.

4.

Since four groups of invention have been identified, the incomplete search report has been drawn up for the first invention (claims 1, 13 and 20) and the applicant is invited to pay 3 additional search fees.

FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM PCT/ISA/ 206

Continuation of Box 3.

Claims Nos.: 3,4,6,7,11,15-19

Independent claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, and 15-19 do not meet the requirements of Rule 39 PCT and are therefore not searched. The reasons are the following:

The "data format" of claims 6 and 7, and the "parameters" of claims 15-19 are a mere representation of information, defined solely by the content of the information, without any technical effect, and therefore do not meet the requirements of Rule 39 (v) PCT.

The "format of indications" as defined in claim 3, the "format of signature", as defined in claim 4, and the "format of signalling" in claim 11, are defined only by the structure of their fields (items "i" - "iv" in claim 3; items "i"-"iii" in claim 4; and items "i"-"iii" in claim 11) and do not comprise any technical features of the system in which they occur. The subject-matter of these claims is therefore considered to be a mere presentation of information, defined solely by the content of the information and without a technical effect of its own, and therefore does not meet the requirements of Rule 39 (v) PCT either.

1. The present communication is an Annex to the invitation to pay additional fees (Form PCT/ISA/206). It shows the results of the international search established on the parts of the international application which relate to the invention first mentioned in claims Nos.:
2. This communication is not the international search report which will be established according to Article 18 and Rule 43.
3. If the applicant does not pay any additional search fees, the information appearing in this communication will be considered as the result of the international search and will be included as such in the international search report.
4. If the applicant pays additional fees, the international search report will contain both the information appearing in this communication and the results of the international search on other parts of the international application for which such fees will have been paid.

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	SRISURESH P ET AL: "Middlebox communicatin architecture and framework;" INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE, XX, XX, 28 February 2002 (2002-02-28), pages 1-35, XP002211545 abstract Section 1., 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.12, 2.14, 2.15, 4., 5. figure 1	1, 13, 20
X	BARBIR A. ET AL: "Requirements for an OPES Service Personalization Callout Server" IETF INTERNET DRAFT, 'Online! 7 March 2002 (2002-03-07), pages 1-25, XP002247308 Retrieved from the Internet: <URL:www.globecom.net/ietf> 'retrieved on 2003-07-09! Section 1., 2., 3., 3.3, 4. figure 1	1, 13, 20
A	SCHULTZRINNE H: "RTP: A transport protocol for real-time applications" NETWORK WORKING GROUP REQUEST FOR COMMENTS, XX, XX, 1 January 1996 (1996-01-01), XP002204956 abstract Section 6., 6.1	13

☐ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☐ Patent family members are listed in annex.

\* Special categories of cited documents :

- \*A\* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- \*E\* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- \*L\* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- \*O\* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- \*P\* document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

- \*T\* later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention
- \*X\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone
- \*Y\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.
- \*G\* document member of the same patent family